arXiv:1408.3255v1 [quant-ph] 14 Aug 2014

CODING THEOREMS FOR HYBRID CHANNELS. II*

Kuznetsova A. A.† Holevo A. S.‡

Abstract

The present work continues investigation of the capacities of measurement (quantum-classical) channels in the most general setting, initiated in [10]. The proof of coding theorems is given for the classical capacity and entanglement-assisted classical capacity of the measurement channel with arbitrary output alphabet, without assuming that the channel is given by a bounded operator-valued density.

1 Introduction

The present work continues investigation of the capacities of measurement channels in the most general setting, initiated in [10]. The proof of coding theorems is given for the classical capacity (theorem 1) and entanglement-assisted classical capacity (theorem 2) of the measurement channel with arbitrary output alphabet under the minimal regularity assumptions. The statement of theorem 2 was proved previously in [10] under additional assumption that the channel is given by a bounded operator-valued density. In the present work we relax this restriction by using a generalization of the Radon-Nikodym theorem for probability operator-valued measures [6]. The result obtained is illustrated by an example of homodyne measurement in quantum optics.

*Work partially supported by RFBR (grant No 12-01-00319) and Russian Quantum Center.

†N. E. Baumann MHTU, Moscow, Russia (kuznetsova.a.a@bk.ru).

‡Steklov Mathematical Institute, RAS, Moscow, Russia (holevo@mi.ras.ru).

We remark that the entanglement-assisted classical capacity was studied by a number of authors under the names *purification capacity, measurement strength, forward classical communication cost.* In the recent paper [2], where one can find further references, its alternative interpretation is developed. It is shown that a (finite-dimensional) measurement channel can be asymptotically simulated by transmission of a classical message of the size equal to the maximal entropy reduction, assisted with sufficient classical correlation between the input and the output. The result can be considered as a quantum reverse Shannon theorem in which entanglement and quantum channel are replaced, correspondingly, by classical correlation and classical channel.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space. We use the following notations: $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of all bounded operators, $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of trace-class operators in $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is its convex subset of *density operators* (i.e. positive operators with unit trace), called also quantum states.

We introduce the measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$, where Ω is a complete separable metric space, $\mathcal{F}$ is a σ-algebra of its subsets, μ is a σ-finite measure on $\mathcal{F}$. A hybrid (classical-quantum) system is described by von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu; \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}))$, consisting of weakly measurable, essentially bounded functions $X(\omega)$, $\omega \in \Omega$ with values in $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Consider the preadjoint space $\mathcal{L}_* = \mathcal{L}_1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu; \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}))$, the elements of which are measurable functions $S = \{S(\omega)\}$ with values in $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$, integrable with respect to the measure μ. An element $S = \{S(\omega)\} \in \mathcal{L}_*$ such that

$$S(\omega) \geq 0 \pmod{\mu}, \qquad \int_\Omega \operatorname{Tr} S(\omega)\, \mu(d\omega) = 1,$$

is called *state* on the algebra $\mathcal{L}$. In notations of entropic characteristics of hybrid systems we will use the index "cq", of classical and quantum systems — the indices "c" and "q" correspondingly.

Following [9], we introduce the notions of entropy and relative entropy of cq-states. Concerning the definitions and properties of quantum entropies see e. g. [8].

Definition 1. The entropy of a cq-state S is defined by the relation

$$H_{\mathrm{cq}}(S) = \int_\Omega H_q(S(\omega))\, \mu(d\omega),$$

where $H_q(S) = -\mathrm{Tr}\, S \log S$ is the von Neumann entropy of positive operator $S \in \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Note that

$$H_{\mathrm{cq}}(S) = H_c(p) + \int_\Omega p(\omega) H_q(\widehat{S}(\omega))\, \mu(d\omega), \tag{1}$$

where $p(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\, S(\omega)$, $\widehat{S}(\omega) = (p(\omega))^{-1} S(\omega)$, $H_c(p)$ is the differential entropy of the probability distribution with the density $p(\omega)$ with respect to the measure μ.

Definition 2. The *relative entropy* of cq-states S_1, S_2 is defined by the relation

$$H_{\mathrm{cq}}(S_1 \parallel S_2) = \int_\Omega H_q(S_1(\omega) \parallel S_2(\omega))\, \mu(d\omega),$$

where

$$H_q(S_1(\omega) \parallel S_2(\omega)) = \mathrm{Tr}\, S_1(\omega)(\log S_1(\omega) - \log S_2(\omega))$$

is the quantum relative entropy.

To describe measurement channels we will need the following definition.

Definition 3. *Probability operator-valued measure* (POVM) on Ω is a family $M = \{M(A),\ A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ of bounded Hermitian operators in $\mathcal{H}$, satisfying the conditions:

1) $M(A) \geq 0$, $A \in \mathcal{F}$;

2) $M(\Omega) = I$, where I is the unit operator in $\mathcal{H}$;

3) for arbitrary countable decomposition $A = \bigcup A_i$ $(A_i \cap A_j = \varnothing,\ i \neq j)$, the relation $M(A) = \sum_i M(A_i)$ holds in the sense of weak convergence of operators.

POVM defines a *quantum observable* with values in Ω. The *probability distribution* of observable M in the state S is given by the formula

$$P_S(A) = \mathrm{Tr}\, SM(A), \qquad A \in \mathcal{F}. \tag{2}$$

For brevity, we sometimes write $P_S(d\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\, SM(d\omega)$.

If POVM $M(d\omega)$ is defined by the density $P(\omega)$ with respect to scalar σ-finite measure μ, where $P(\omega)$ is a uniformly bounded (with respect to the oprator norm) weakly measurable operator-valued function, then its probability distribution has the density $p_S(\omega) = \mathrm{Tr}\, SP(\omega)$ with respect to the measure μ. This case is studied in [10].

In the general case the following lemma holds (a generalization of the Radon-Nikodym theorem for POVM [6]).

Lemma 1. For an arbitrary POVM on a separable metric space Ω there exist a dense subspace $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{H}$, a σ-finite measure μ on Ω, a countable set of Borel functions $\omega \to a_k(\omega)$ where for almost all ω the $a_k(\omega)$ are linear functionals on $\mathcal{D}$, satsfying the conditions

$$\int_\Omega \sum_k |\langle a_k(\omega)|\psi\rangle|^2 \, \mu(d\omega) = \|\psi\|^2, \qquad \psi \in \mathcal{D}, \tag{3}$$

$$\langle \psi | M(A) \psi \rangle = \int_A \sum_k |\langle a_k(\omega)|\psi\rangle|^2 \, \mu(d\omega), \qquad \psi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{4}$$

In [6] it is shown that for $\mathcal{D}$ one can take $\operatorname{lin}\{\varphi_i\}$ — the linear span of a fixed orthonormal basis $\{\varphi_i\}$.

Lemma 2. For arbitrary observable $M(d\omega)$ with values in Ω and a density operator $S \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, the probability distribution $P_S(d\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} SM(d\omega)$ has density $p_S(\omega)$ with respect to measure μ.

Proof. Consider the spectral decomposition of the state S:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|. \tag{5}$$

Apply lemma 1, with $\mathcal{D} = \operatorname{lin}\{\varphi_i\}$. For all $A \in \mathcal{F}$ the equality holds

$$P_S(A) \equiv \operatorname{Tr} SM(A) = \int_A p_S(\omega) \, \mu(d\omega), \tag{6}$$

where

$$p_S(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \sum_k |\langle a_k(\omega)|\varphi_i\rangle|^2$$

is a nonnegative integrable function is a nonnegative integrable function by the condition (3) and the spectral decomposition (5). The lemma is proved.

Let us fix an orthonormal system $\{e_k\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. According to the same conditions (3) and (5), the relation

$$\widehat{S}(\omega) = (p_S(\omega))^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i \sum_{j,k} |e_k\rangle\langle a_k(\omega)|\varphi_i\rangle \overline{\langle a_j(\omega)|\varphi_i\rangle} \langle e_j| \tag{7}$$

for P_S-almost all ω defines a density operator in $\mathcal{H}$, which we will call *posterior state*. The meaning of this term is that under certain conditions the operator $\widehat{S}(\omega)$ describes state of the quantum system after measurement of observable M, which resulted with the outcome ω [8].

Following [7], define the *entropy reduction* by the relation

$$\mathrm{ER}\,(S, M) = H_q(S) - \int_\Omega p(\omega) H_q(\widehat{S}(\omega))\,\mu(d\omega), \tag{8}$$

which is consistent provided $H_q(S) < \infty$. We mention the following approximation properties. Consider a sequence of states $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{\lambda}_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$, where $\widetilde{\lambda}_i = (\sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k)^{-1}\lambda_i$. By lemma 4 of the paper [11], the above sequence S_n satisfies the condition

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} H_q(S_n) = H_q(S) < \infty. \tag{9}$$

According to the theorem 2 from [7], this implies

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathrm{ER}\,(S_n, M) = \mathrm{ER}\,(S, M) < \infty. \tag{10}$$

3 The classical capacity of a measurement channel

Definition 4. Let M be a POVM, P_S — its probability distribution in the state S, which is given by the formula (2). *Measurement channel* $\mathcal{M}$ is an affine map $S \to P_S(d\omega)$ of the convex set of quantum states $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ into the set of probability distributions on Ω.

To apply the method of block coding, we need to define the n-th degree $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ of the channel $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$ be the n-th tensor degree of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and let $(\Omega^{\times n}, \mathcal{F}^{\times n})$ be the product of n copies of the measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. The cnannel $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ is defined by the observable $M^{\otimes n}$ with values in $\Omega^{\times n}$ such that

$$M^{\otimes n}(A_1 \times \cdots \times A_n) = M(A_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes M(A_n).$$

By using an analog of the extension theorem for POVM, one can show that this relation defines uniquely all the values $M^{\otimes n}(A^{(n)})$, $A^{(n)} \in \mathcal{F}^{\times n}$.

In the case of infinite-dimensional $\mathcal{H}$ one usually introduces a constraint onto the input states of the channel (otherwise the capacities are infinite as a rule). Let F be a positive selfadjoint (in general unbounded) operator in the space $\mathcal{H}$, with the spectral decomposition $F = \int_0^\infty x\, dE(x)$, where $E(x)$ is the spectral function. We introduce the subset of states

$$\mathcal{A}_E = \{S \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) : \operatorname{Tr} SF \leq E\}, \tag{11}$$

where E is a positive constant, and the trace in (11) is understood as the integral $\int_0^\infty x\, d(\operatorname{Tr} SE(x))$ (for more detail see [3]). Notice that if the operator F satisfies the condition

$$\operatorname{Tr} \exp(-\beta F) < \infty \qquad \beta > 0, \tag{12}$$

then $H_q(S) < \infty$ for all S such that $\operatorname{Tr} SF \leq E$ (see [3]). The corresponding constraint for the channel $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ is determined by the operator

$$F^{(n)} = F \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes I + \cdots + I \otimes I \otimes \cdots \otimes F.$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{A}_E^{(n)} = \{S^{(n)} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}) : \operatorname{Tr} S^{(n)} F^{(n)} \leq nE\}. \tag{13}$$

Definition 5. The *code* of length n and size N is a pair $(\Sigma^{(n)}, \mathcal{V}^{(n)})$, where:

1) $\Sigma^{(n)} = \{S_i^{(n)},\ i = 1, \ldots, N\}$ is a family of states from $\mathcal{A}_E^{(n)}$;

2) $\mathcal{V}^{(n)} = \{V_j,\ j = 0, 1, \ldots, N\}$ is a decomposition of the space $\Omega^{\times n}$.

Definition 6. The *average error probability* of the code $(\Sigma^{(n)}, \mathcal{V}^{(n)})$ is the quantity

$$\overline{u}(\Sigma^{(n)}, \mathcal{V}^{(n)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \big(1 - \operatorname{Tr} S_j^{(n)} M^{\otimes n}(V_j)\big). \tag{14}$$

We denote by $u(n, N)$ the greatest lower bound of the quantity $\overline{u}(\Sigma^{(n)}, \mathcal{V}^{(n)})$ with respect to all codes of length n and size N.

Definition 7. We call the *classical capacity* $C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E)$ of the measurement channel $\mathcal{M}$ with the constraint (13) the supremum of all achievable rates i.e. the values $R > 0$, satisfying the condition

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} u(n, 2^{nR}) = 0. \tag{15}$$

We call by *ensemble* of states a finite probability distribution $\pi = \{\pi_x; S_x\}$ on the set of states $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, ascribing probabilities π_x to certain states S_x. The

average state of ensemble is defined as: $\overline{S}_\pi = \sum_x \pi_x S_x$. Let us denote $\mathcal{P}_E$ the set of ensembles π such that $\overline{S}_\pi \in \mathcal{A}_E$; similarly, we denote $\mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}$ the set of ensembles $\pi^{(n)}$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n})$, the average state of which satisfying the condition (13).

For given measurement channel $\mathcal{M}$ and ensemble π define the quantity

$$I(\pi, \mathcal{M}) = \sum_x \pi_x \int_\Omega p(\omega|x) \log \frac{p(\omega|x)}{\overline{p}(\omega)} \, \mu(d\omega). \tag{16}$$

Here $\overline{p}(\omega)$ and $p(\omega|x)$ are the probability densities of the distributions $\overline{P}(d\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} \overline{S}_\pi M(d\omega)$ and $P_x(d\omega) = \operatorname{Tr} S_x M(d\omega)$ correspondingly. The quantity $I(\pi, \mathcal{M})$ is the Shannon mutual information between the discrete random variable X, having the probability distribution $\{\pi_x\}$ and the random variable ω with conditional probability density $p(\omega \,|\, x)$, defined via lemma 2. Notice that there is a representation of the quantity $I(\pi, \mathcal{M})$ as a supremum over decompositions $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}$ of the output space Ω (cf. [5, formula (1.2.3)]):

$$I(\pi, \mathcal{M}) = \sup_{\mathcal{V}} \left(\sum_i \sum_x \pi_x P_x(V_i) \log \frac{P_x(V_i)}{\overline{P}(V_i)} \right). \tag{17}$$

The quantity under supremum is equal to $I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V})$, where $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}$ is the measurement channel, corresponding to the discrete observable $\{M(V_i)\}$.

Theorem 1. The classical capacity of the measurement channel $\mathcal{M}$ with the constraint (13) is given by the relation

$$C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}). \tag{18}$$

Proof. Denote

$$C_n = \sup_{\pi^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}).$$

We need to show that

$$C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = C_1.$$

Let us first establish the additivity property $C_n = nC_1$.

For a fixed decomposition $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}$, the measurement channel $\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}$ is embedded into quantum entanglement-breaking channel (see e.g. [4]), therefore according to [3] its capacity is given by the expression

$$C(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{V}), \tag{19}$$

and has the additivity property (see [6])

$$C(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{A}_E^{(n)}) = nC(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{A}_E).$$

Notice that similarly to (19), the left-hand side is equal to $\sup_{\pi^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n})$, so that

$$\sup_{\pi^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n}) = n \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}). \tag{20}$$

By using a result of R. L. Dobrushin (theorem 2.2 in [5]), we have

$$I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}) = \sup_{\mathcal{V}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n}),$$

because the supremum in the right-hand side is equal to the supremum of the information with respect to decompositions of the space $\Omega^{\times n}$ of special form, consisting of products $V_1 \times \cdots \times V_n$ of the sets from the decomposition $\mathcal{V}$. The class of all such products has the ordering property that is required for validity of theorem 2.2 in [5]. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} C_n &= \sup_{\pi^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}} \sup_{\mathcal{V}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n}) = \sup_{\mathcal{V}} \sup_{\pi^{(n)} \in \mathcal{P}_E^{(n)}} I(\pi^{(n)}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}^{\otimes n}) \\ &= n \sup_{\mathcal{V}} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}) = n \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} \sup_{\mathcal{V}} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}) \\ &= n \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}) = nC_1, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (20) in the third equality.

Now let us prove the inequality $C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) \leq C_1$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $C_1 < \infty$. Let $R > C_1$. By applying Fano's inequality, we obtain similarly to the relation (10.19) in [8]

$$u(n, 2^{nR}) \geq 1 - \frac{C_n}{nR} - \frac{1}{nR} = 1 - \frac{C_1}{R} - \frac{1}{nR},$$

where in the second equality we used the additivity $C_n = nC_1$. Therefore $\liminf_{n\to\infty} u(n, 2^{nR}) > 0$, and hence $C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) \leq C_1$.

For the proof of the converse inequality we note that

$$C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) \geq C(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}})$$

for arbitrary decomposition $\mathcal{V}$. By taking supremum over the decompositions $\mathcal{V}$, we obtain $C(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) \geq \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_E} I(\pi, \mathcal{M}) = C_1$. The theorem 1 is proved.

4 Entanglement-assisted capacity of a measurement channel

Consider the following protocol of classical information transmission through the measurement channel $\mathcal{M}$. Transmitter A and receiver B are in the pure entangled state $S_{AB} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, where $|\psi\rangle = \sum_j c_j |e_j\rangle \otimes |\widetilde{e_j}\rangle$, satisfying the condition $H_q(S_A) = H_q(S_B) < \infty$.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a finite alphabet, and the classical signal $x \in \mathcal{X}$ appears with probability π_x. The party A performs encoding $x \to \mathcal{E}_x$ and sends its part of the resulting common state via the channel $\mathcal{M}$. Thus the party B has at its disposal the hybrid system ΩB, where Ω is the classical system at the output of the measurement channel. After the measurement of observable $M(d\omega)$, the state in the hybrid system is described in the following way:

$$\sigma_x(d\omega) = \sum_{j,k} c_j \overline{c}_k [\mathrm{Tr}\, \mathcal{E}_x(|e_j\rangle\langle e_k|) M(d\omega)] |\widetilde{e_j}\rangle\langle\widetilde{e_k}|.$$

Then the party B may perform measurement of an observable in the system ΩB, extracting in this way information about the signal x.

With the block coding, the encoded states transmitted through the channel $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_B^{\otimes n}$, have the form

$$S_\alpha^{(n)} = (\mathcal{E}_\alpha^{(n)} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_B^{\otimes n})[S_{AB}^{(n)}], \tag{21}$$

where $S_{AB}^{(n)}$ is pure entangled state for n copies of the system AB, satisfying the condition $H(S_B^{(n)}) < \infty$, α is the classical message (e.g. a word in an alphabet $\mathcal{X}$), $\alpha \to \mathcal{E}_\alpha^{(n)}$ are the encodings for n copies of the system A. The input states of the channel $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}$ are subject to the constraint (13), which is equivalent to similar constraint for the channel $\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_B^{\otimes n}$ with the operators $F^{(n)} \otimes I_B^{\otimes n}$.

For the channel $\mathcal{M}$ with the input constraint (11) we consider the quantity

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}^{(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{A}_E^{(n)}) = \sup_{(\pi_\alpha^{(n)}, S_\alpha^{(n)})} \chi_{\mathrm{cq}}\left(\{\pi_\alpha^{(n)}\}; \{(\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathrm{Id}_B^{\otimes n}) S_\alpha^{(n)}\}\right), \tag{22}$$

where

$$\chi_{\mathrm{cq}}\left(\{\pi_x\}; \{S_x\}\right) = H_{\mathrm{cq}}\left(\sum_x \pi_x S_x\right) - \sum_x \pi_x H_{\mathrm{cq}}(S_x), \qquad S_x \in \mathcal{L}_*,$$

and the supremum is taken over all state ensembles of the form (21), satisfying the condition

$$\sum_\alpha \pi_\alpha^{(n)} \mathrm{Tr}\, S_\alpha^{(n)} (F^{(n)} \otimes I_B^{\otimes n}) \le nE.$$

The *classical entanglement-assisted capacity* for the quantum-classical channel $\mathcal{M}$ with the constraint (11) is defined by the relation

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} C_{\mathrm{ea}}^{(n)}(\mathcal{M}^{\otimes n}, \mathcal{A}_E^{(n)}).$$

Theorem 2. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary measurement channel with the input constraint (13). Assume, that the operator F satisfies the condition (12), and the channel $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies the condition

$$\sup_{S_A:\mathrm{Tr}\, S_A F\le E} H_c(p_{S_A}) < \infty, \tag{23}$$

where $H_c(p_{S_A})$ is the classical differential entropy of the probability density of the output distribution of the channel $\mathcal{M}$. Then the entanglement-assisted capacity is given by the expression

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \sup_{S_A:\mathrm{Tr}\, S_A F\le E} \mathrm{ER}\,(S_A, M). \tag{24}$$

Proof. In the proof we use the corresponding result for measurement channels defined by a bounded operator density, obtained in [10].

Let S_{AB} be the initial entangled state of the system AB. After applying encoding $\mathcal{E}_A^x$ in the system A the state of the composite system is described by the operator

$$S_{AB}^x = (\mathcal{E}_A^x \otimes \mathrm{Id}_B) S_{AB}$$

with the partial states $S_A^x = \mathcal{E}_A^x(S_A)$ and $S_B^x = S_B$.

To establish the inequality $\le$ in the formula (24), it is sufficient to prove (see [10] for detail) that

$$H_{\mathrm{cq}}\Big(\sum_x \pi_x (\mathcal{M}\otimes \mathrm{Id}_B) S_{AB}^x\Big) - \sum_x \pi_x H_{\mathrm{cq}}\,(\mathcal{M}\otimes \mathrm{Id}_B(S_{AB}^x)) \le \mathrm{ER}\,(\overline{S}_A, M). \tag{25}$$

Here $\overline{S}_A = \sum_x \pi_x S_A^x$, and the constraint (13) implies the condition

$$\mathrm{Tr}\, \overline{S}_A F \le E. \tag{26}$$

A result of [10] implies that the relation (25) holds for finite-rank states $\overline{S}_A$ satisfying the constraint (26). For the proof in the general case we apply approximation by finite-rank states.

Assume first that $\operatorname{Tr}\overline{S}_A F \leq E' < E$ for a positive E'. Let $\overline{S}_A$ have the spectral decomposition $\overline{S}_A = \sum_i \lambda_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$. Consider the increasing sequence of projections $P_n = \sum_{i=1}^n |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$ converging to the unit operator I_A, and the sequence of states

$$S^x_{AB}(n) = P_n \otimes I_B S^x_{AB} P_n \otimes I_B + |\phi\rangle\langle\phi| \otimes (S_B - S^x_B(n)),$$

where $S^x_B(n) = \operatorname{Tr}_A(P_n \otimes I_B S^x_{AB} P_n \otimes I_B)$, $|\phi\rangle$ is a fixed unit vector from $\operatorname{lin}\{\varphi_i\}$, belonging to the domain of $\sqrt{F}$. The partial states of $S^x_{AB}(n)$ are

$$\operatorname{Tr}_B S^x_{AB}(n) = S^x_A(n) = P_n S^x_A P_n + (1 - \operatorname{Tr} P_n S^x_A)|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|, \quad \operatorname{Tr}_A S^x_{AB}(n) = S_B.$$

Then the average state in the system A is equal to

$$\overline{S}_A(n) = \sum_x \pi_x S^x_A(n) = P_n \overline{S}_A P_n + (1 - \operatorname{Tr} P_n \overline{S}_A)|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|.$$

We have $\overline{S}_A(n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i| + (1 - \operatorname{Tr} P_n \overline{S}_A)|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, then $\|\overline{S}_A(n) - \overline{S}_A\|_1 \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$ and

$$\operatorname{Tr}\overline{S}_A(n) F = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \|\sqrt{F}\varphi_i\|^2 + (1 - \operatorname{Tr} P_n \overline{S}_A)\langle\phi|F\phi\rangle \leq E' + \varepsilon_n,$$

$\varepsilon_n \to 0 \;\; n \to \infty$. Thus, starting from some value of n, the density operator $\overline{S}_A(n)$ satisfies the input constraint (26).

Using the condition (23), similarly to the proof of the coding theorem for measurement of observable in [10] we obtain the inequality (25) for the ensemble $\{\pi_x, S^x_{AB}(n)\}$, which can be written in the following form based on the relative entropy:

$$\sum_x \pi_x H_{\mathrm{cq}}\left((\mathcal{M}\otimes\mathrm{Id}_B)(S^x_{AB}(n)) \,\middle\|\, \sum_x \pi_x (\mathcal{M}\otimes\mathrm{Id}_B) S^x_{AB}(n) \right) \leq \mathrm{ER}\,(\operatorname{Tr}\overline{S}_A(n), M). \tag{27}$$

Take the limit $n \to \infty$ in (27). By noting that $\lim_{n\to\infty} H_q(\overline{S}_A(n)) = H_q(\overline{S}_A)$, using theorem 2 from [7] (i.e. the equality (10)) in the left-had side and the lower semicontinuity of the relative entropy in the right-hand side, we obtain (25) for the ensemble $\{\pi_x, S^x_{AB}\}$.

Now consider the case $\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{S}_A F = E$. Take a unit vector $|e\rangle \in \mathrm{lin}\{\phi_i\}$, satisfying the condition $\langle e|Fe\rangle < E$, and construct the approximation $S^x_{AB}(\varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon)S^x_{AB} + \varepsilon|e\rangle\langle e| \otimes S_B,\ 0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then the average state of the system A is $\overline{S}_A(\varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon)\overline{S}_A + \varepsilon|e\rangle\langle e|$, and the following condition holds

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{S}_A(\varepsilon)F < E.$$

Let us repeat previous argument approximating $S^x_{AB}(\varepsilon)$ by the states of the form

$$(1-\varepsilon)P_n \otimes I_B S^x_{AB} P_n \otimes I_B + |e\rangle\langle e|(S_B - (1-\varepsilon)\mathrm{Tr}_A P_n \otimes I_B S^x_{AB})$$

with the partial states $(1-\varepsilon)S^x_A + (1-(1-\varepsilon)\mathrm{Tr}\,P_n S^x_A)|e\rangle\langle e|$ and S_B in the systems A and B correspondingly. We obtain that the inequality (25) holds for $S^x_{AB}(\varepsilon)$, $\overline{S}_A(\varepsilon)$. Since $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} H_q(\overline{S}_A(\varepsilon)) = H_q(\overline{S}_A)$, then, tending ε to zero we obtain (25) for ensembles satisfying the condition $\mathrm{Tr}\,\overline{S}_A F = E$. The rest of the proof is similar to the case of observable with a bounded density [10].

To prove the inequality $\geq$ in (24) we consider an arbitrary state $S \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, $S = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$, satisfying the input constraint. Apply lemma 1, setting $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{lin}\,\{\varphi_i\}$ and defining posterior states $\widehat{S}(\omega)$ by the relation (7). Then the argument is similar to trhe proof of proposition 4 from [3], and also theorem 3 from [10]. Theorem 2 is proved.

Of special interest is the case of *pure* POVM for which there exists a representation (4) of the form

$$\langle\psi|M(A)\psi\rangle = \int_A |\langle a(\omega)|\psi\rangle|^2\,\mu(d\omega), \qquad \psi \in \mathcal{D}. \tag{28}$$

In this case the posterior state (7) is a pure state, not depending on x:

$$\widehat{S}(\omega) = |e\rangle\langle e|, \tag{29}$$

where $e \in \mathcal{H}$ is a unit vector. Thus, $H_q(\widehat{S}(\omega)) = 0$ and the entropy reduction is equal to

$$\mathrm{ER}\,(S, M) = H_q(S). \tag{30}$$

The relation (24) takes the form

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \sup_{S_A:\mathrm{Tr}\,S_A F \leq E} H_q(S). \tag{31}$$

It is well known that this supremum is attained on the Gibbs state

$$S_\beta = c(\beta)^{-1} \exp(-\beta F), \qquad c(\beta) = \mathrm{Tr}\, \exp(-\beta F), \tag{32}$$

where β is found from the condition $\mathrm{Tr}\, S_\beta F = E$, and it is equal to $\beta E + c(\beta)$. Thus theorem 2 implies the following statement.

Corollary 1. For arbitrary measurement channel, corresponding to pure POVM,

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \beta E + c(\beta),$$

where β is found from the condition $\mathrm{Tr}\, S_\beta F = E$.

Let us illustrate this result by two examples. Let $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbf{R})$, Q be the operator of multiplication by x, $P = -id/dx$ with the common essential domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$ (the space of infinitely differentiable functions rapidly decreasing with all derivatives, see e.g. [8]). The spectral measure M of the selfadjoint operator Q can be represented in the form (28):

$$\langle \psi | M(A) \psi \rangle = \int_A |\langle x|\psi\rangle|^2 \, dx, \qquad \psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R}),$$

where $\langle x|\psi\rangle = \psi(x)$, $\psi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{R})$, are the Dirac's δ-functionals. Thus the POVM M does not have bounded operator density, the result of the paper [10] is not applicable and one should apply the approach of the present paper. Arbitrary density operator S in $L^2(\mathbf{R})$ is defined by the kernel which is conveniently written in the symbolic form $\langle x|S|y\rangle$ (for continuous kernels this notation can be understood literally). Consider the channel corresponding to the measurement of observable Q, which maps a density operator S into the probability density $\langle x|S|x\rangle$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the real line. In quantum optics such a channels describes statistics of *homodyne measurement* of one mode Q, P of electromagnetic field [12]. As a constraint operator one usually takes the oscillator energy $F = (P^2 + Q^2)/2$. Notice that the condition (23) is fulfilled, as the inequality $\mathrm{Tr}\, SF \leq E$ implies

$$\int x^2 p_S(x)\, dx = \mathrm{Tr}\, SQ^2 \leq 2\mathrm{Tr}\, SF \leq 2E,$$

and the maximal differential entropy (equal to $(1/2)\log(2\pi e(2E))$) under this constraint is attained on the Gaussian probability density. Substituting this value of supremum, equal to the entropy of the Gibbs state of oscillator with the mean energy E (see e.g. [12], [8]) into (31), we obtain

$$C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \left(E + \frac{1}{2}\right) \log \left(E + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \left(E - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log \left(E - \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{33}$$



Figure 1: Classical capacities of the optical measurement channels

On the other hand, the classical capacity of homodyne channel computed in [12], [13] is equal to

$$C(\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \log(2E). \tag{34}$$

According to the corollary 1, the relation (33) holds for arbitrary pure measurement channel including *heterodyne channel*, which maps a density operator S into probability density $\langle x, y|S|x, y\rangle$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on the plane, where $|x, y\rangle$ are the coherent states of the quantum oscillator [4]. Notice that in this case the bounded operator density exists and results of paper [10] are applicable. The classical capacity of the heterodyne channel computed in [13], [4] is equal to

$$C(\mathcal{M}_{\text{het}}, \mathcal{A}_E) = \log\left(E + \frac{1}{2}\right). \tag{35}$$

For all $E > 1/2$ the inequalities hold

$$C(\mathcal{M}_{\text{het}}, \mathcal{A}_E) < C(\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}, \mathcal{A}_E) < C_{\text{ea}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_E).$$

The graphs of the three capacities are shown on Fig. 1.

References

[1] *Bennett C. H., Shor P. W., Smolin J. A., Thapliyal A. V.* Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem. — IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 2002, v. 48, No 10, p. 2637–2655.

[2] *Berta M., Renes J. M., Wilde M. M.* Identifying the information gain of a quantum measurement. arXiv:1301.1594.

[3] *Holevo A. S.* The classical capacities of quantum channel with input constraint. — Theory Probab. Appl., 2004, v. 48, No 2, p. 243255.

[4] *Holevo A. S.* Information capacity of quantum observable. — Problems Inform. Transmission, 2012, v. 48, No 1, p. 1–10 .

[5] *Dobrushin R. L.* General formulation of Shannon theorem in information theory. — Russian Math. Surveys, 1959, v. 14, No 6, p. 3–104.

[6] *Holevo A. S.* Entanglement-breaking channels in infinite dimensions. — Problems Inform. Transmission, 2008, v. 44, No 3, p. 171-184 .

[7] *Shirokov M. E.* Entropy reduction of quantum measurement. — J. Math. Phys., 2011, v. 52, No 5, paper No 052202, 18 p.

[8] *Holevo A. S.* Quantum systems, channels, information. .: , 2010, 327 .

[9] *Barchielli A., Lupieri G.* Instruments and mutual entropies in quantum information. — Banach Center Publ., 2006, v. 73, p. 65–80.

[10] *Kuznetsova A. A., Holevo A. S.* Coding theorems for hybrid channels. — Theory Probab. Appl., 2013, v. 58, No 2, p. 298–324.

[11] *Lindblad G.* Expectations and entropy inequalities for finite quantum systems. — Comm. Math. Phys., 1974, v. 39, p. 111–119.

[12] *Caves C. M., Drummond P. B.* Quantum limits of bosonic communication rates. — Rev. Modern Phys., 1994, v. 66, p. 481–538.

[13] *Hall M. J. W.* Quantum information and correlation bounds. — Phys. Rev. A, 1997, v. 55, No 1, p. 100–113.